

Remarks

Claims 1-50 were pending. Claims 1, 12, 22, 33, 39, and 45 have been amended while claims 24, and 26 have been cancelled. Applicants assert that all claims are in condition for allowance as more specifically set forth below.

102 Rejections

The Office Action has rejected claims 1-50 as being anticipated by Underwood (US Pat 6,633,878). Applicants hereby traverse these rejections.

All independent claims have now including recitations that the configuration of the first database specifies the number of fields, field length, and data type and further include recitations to the configuration of the second database being a copy of that of the first, and that the changed first configuration is the same as the changed second configuration.

As a representative example, claim 1 recites a method for database configuration migration. Claim 1 recites, among other things, providing a first database having a configuration that specifies a number of data fields, a length of each data field, and a type of data for each data field; copying the configuration of the first database to a second database; and implementing a change in the configuration of the first database based at least in part on the configuration change transaction record such that the changed configuration of the first database is the same as the changed configuration of the second database.

In rejecting the claims and further in response to Applicant's previous arguments, the Office Action notes that the first database and the second database of interest in Underwood are those being discussed at Col. 2, lines 12-18. While the Office Action also cites Col. 72, lines 50-55, there is no explicit discussion of first and second databases, so the Office Action is apparently relying on the first and second database of column 2. In reading the citation at Col. 2, lines 12-18, it is evident that the first and second database are different in many ways and there is not disclosure or suggestion that they share a same configuration, much less share the same configuration both before and after a configuration change as recited in the claims. Specifically, Col. 2 lines 12-18 and FIG. 132.1 disclose that the first database stores information relating to issues while the

second database stores tables including at least on of a plurality of user interfaces and application logic for accessing information in the first database. There is no disclosure that the number of fields, field lengths, and data types of the first configuration and the second configuration are the same, and the entirely different data and purposes of the databases in Underwood suggests that the configuration of the two is not the same.

Therefore, Applicants assert that pending claims 1-23, 25, and 27-50 include recitations not disclosed by Underwood. Applicants further assert that claims 1-23, 25, and 27-50 are allowable over Underwood for at least these reasons.


Conclusion

Applicants assert that the application including claims 1-23, 25, and 27-50 is in condition for allowance. Applicants request reconsideration in view of the amendments and remarks above and further request that a Notice of Allowability be provided. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact the undersigned.

No fees are believed due beyond the fee for continued examination. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 7, 2005


Jeramie J. Keys
Reg. No. 42,724

Withers & Keys, LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, Ga 30007-1355
(404) 849.2093